REMARKS

Claims 1-7 and 9-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1-6, 12, 14, 16-17, and 21 have been canceled. Reconsideration and allowance is hereby respectfully requested in light of the amendments and the following remarks. This response follows the revised amendment format promulgated January 31, 2003 which waives the current requirement of 37 C.F.R. §1.121 for both a clean and marked up version of amendments.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-6 and 15-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer et al. (US 6,125,391) in view of Ellesson et al. (US 6,101,541). Claims 7 and 9-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meltzer in view of Ellesson, further in view of Bayeh et al. (U.S. 6,012,098). Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Meltzer and Ellesson is improper. As the PTO recognizes in MPEP §2143.01, "[t]o establish a prima facie case of obviousness, . . . the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." With respect to the remaining independent claims 7, 15 and 18, it is submitted that the Office action does not factually support a prima facie case of obviousness based on these references for the following reasons.

Independent claim 7 claims "after receiving the first event from the application, receiving a second event from the application." Independent claim 15 claims "receiving an event from an application prior to receiving event data from the distributed directory." Independent claim 18 claims "software for detecting an application event in the application prior to detecting the directory event" and "whereby the distributed directory becomes aware of the application event by having the application event provided to the distributed directory in a transformed state." As the Examiner correctly observed, Meltzer does not teach the use of a directory. To overcome this deficiency, the Examiner attempted to combine Meltzer with Elleson.

However, Elleson expressly states:

It is important to understand that the directory server contacts the client nodes, *and not the reverse*, to retrieve and/or transmit data related to the volatile data items in order to update the volatile data items (e.g., classification rules, policy rules, port numbers to mark data etc.) maintained by the directory server and/or the client nodes. (Elleson, col. 3, lines 27-32) (emphasis added).

Clearly, Elleson teaches that the directory server initiates the contact with the applications, and not the reverse. Elleson teaches away from a directory wherein the application makes initial contact with the directory. In contrast, independent claim 7 claims "after receiving the first event from the application,

receiving a second event from the application," independent claim 15 claims "receiving an event from an application prior to receiving event data from the distributed directory," and independent claim 18 claims "software for detecting an application event in the application prior to detecting the directory event" and "whereby the distributed directory becomes aware of the application event by having the application event provided to the distributed directory in a transformed state."

Respectfully, the Examiner has not made out the prima facie case of obviousness required under § 103. Therefore, the rejection as to independent claims 7, 15, and 18 should be withdrawn. Because claims 9-11, 13, 19-20, and 22 depend from and further limit the independent claims, they too are in condition for allowance.

Conclusion

Therefore it is respectfully submitted that claims 7-11, 13, 15, 18-20, and 22 are in a condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner deem that amendment is desirable to place this application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the below listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,

David M. O'Dell
Registration No. 42,044

Dated: 6-23-03

HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP
901 Main Street, Suite 3100
Dallas, Texas 75202-3789
Telephone: 972-739-8635
Facsimile: 972-692-9118
File: 26530.6
D-1140078.1

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Commissioner for Patents; P.O. Box 1450; Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on June 23, 2003

Debbie Lewis
Signature of person mailing paper and fee